

DNA
PROGRAM CONSULTATION & COORDINATION/DNA CHECKLIST
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
TUCSON FIELD OFFICE

PART II: NEPA Adequacy REVIEW Turbo NEPA #:AZ-060-2005-001

ASSIGNMENT AND REVIEW

Subactivity: 1040
Case/Project No.: N/A

Project Name: Brush Removal in Pronghorn Habitat

Location (legal description): Las Cienegas NCA, T20S R17E Sections 10, 11 & 15.

NLCS Unit: Las Cienegas NCA _____
Quad Name: __Elgin _____
Project Lead: __Keith Hughes _____

Draft Review: Unit Manager/Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Technical Review:

Criteria	NAME	CRITERIA	SIGNATURE	DATE
Applies? Yes No				
() ()	Bill Auby	(1) The new proposed action is a feature of or essentially the same as the alternative selected in the document being reviewed.		
() ()	Francisco Mendoza	(2) A reasonable range of alternatives to the new proposed action was analyzed in the document being reviewed.		
() ()	Jack Whetstone	(3) The information or circumstances upon which the document being reviewed are based are still valid and germane to the new proposed action.		
() ()	Bill Auby	(4) The methodology and analytical approach used in the document being reviewed is appropriate for the new action.		
() ()	Dan Moore	(5) The direct and indirect impacts of the new proposed action do not significantly differ from, or essentially the same as, those identified in the document being reviewed.		
() ()	Francisco Mendoza	(6) The new proposed action, if implemented, would not significantly change the cumulative impact analysis..		
() ()	Max Witkind	(7) Public involvement in the document being reviewed provides suitable coverage for the new proposed action..		

Approval:

Manager/Supervisor: _____ Date: _____
Environmental Coordinator: _____ Date: _____
Field Manager: _____ Date: _____

Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

A. BLM Office: Tucson Field Office

Case File No. N/A

Turbo NEPA # **AZ-060-2005-001**

Proposed Action Title/Type: Brush Removal in Pronghorn Habitat

Location of Proposed Action:

Las Cienegas NCA, T20S R17E Section 10,11 &15. See attached Map.

Description of the Proposed Action: Up to 10 acres of rabbit brush will be mechanically cut using a chainsaw in dry washes and adjacent uplands at the approaches to culverts crossing under Highway 82. The culverts are available to be used by pronghorn to pass under Highway 82. The removal of this brush will provide greater visibility for pronghorn as they approach the culverts and should increase the usability of the culverts. Project maintenance and monitoring activities, which may include repeat cutting of the brush if it re-grows and monitoring use of the culverts by pronghorn (via remote camera, observation, or track plates) may occur during FY2005 – FY2008.

Applicant (if any): N/A

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

Las Cienegas National Conservation Area RMP/ EIS/ ROD 2003

☐The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Use prescribed fire and/or mechanical or chemical vegetation treatments as well as periodic rest from grazing to meet the habitat objective for pronghorn. (WF21)

Support investigations of pronghorn use of highway underpasses and explore other partnership opportunities to help pronghorn cross highways. (Note: Include possibility of overpasses if highway is ever re-engineered. Using areas with cuts on each side would essentially form short tunnels for vehicles.) (AA09)

And Appendix 8:

MECHANICAL TREATMENTS

BLM will also use mechanical methods where practical to control undesirable plants. Choosing the best mechanical method will depend upon several factors:

- *Characteristics of the target plant species (density, size of stem, brittleness, and sprouting ability).*

- *Need for seedbed preparation and revegetation of the treated area.*
- *Topography and terrain of the treatment area.*
- *Kind of soil (depth, amount of rock, erosiveness, and degree of compaction).*
- *Site potential. (The cost of improvement should be consistent with expected productivity.)*

Some possible methods include bulldozing, root cutting, plowing, disking, chaining, brush cutting and crushing, mowing, contouring, seedbed preparation, and planting.

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Proposed Las Cienegas RMP/Final Environmental Impact Statement, 2002

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

Biological Opinion on the Proposed Las Cienegas RMP/Final Environmental Impact Statement, 2002

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

1. The proposed action is a feature of or essentially the same as the alternative selected in the document being reviewed.

Rationale: *Yes, this activity was prescribed and analyzed in the Las Cienegas RMP/ROD 2003*

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the EIS for the Las Cienegas RMP/ROD is appropriate and includes the analysis of the no action alternative which would be to not conduct vegetation treatments in pronghorn habitat.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning

condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, TFO recently performed extensive review and analysis of the project area in the recently completed EIS for the Las Cienegas RMP. The Biological Opinion issued for the Las Cienegas RMP also covers this type of project.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the analysis methods used in the EIS are appropriate for this proposed action. In addition, the proposed action has been reviewed by the Tucson Field Office NEPA review team for consistency.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Yes

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes, the activity is minimal and cumulative impacts unchanged.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately for the current proposed action?

Yes, the decision that is being implemented went through extensive public participation and review during the Sonoita Valley Planning Partnership input on the Las Cienegas RMP/ROD..

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Karen Simms	Ecosystem Planning Team Lead	Riparian
Keith Hughes	Natural Resource Specialist	Wildlife, T&E and Range
Catie Fenn	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
TFO Nepa Review Team		

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

- 1) Ground disturbance is not anticipated to occur from this project as the plants will be cut and not dug up. Should any ground disturbance become necessary, then cultural clearances will be completed at least one week prior to any ground disturbing portions of this restoration project, and any cultural sites or resources will be avoided as recommended by the Archaeologist.

CONCLUSION

- Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked.

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date